

**CDPAC Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, November 7, 2002**  
**State Capitol Building**

**Welcome, Introductions and Committee Business**

Kathy Malaske-Samu called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for attending. She said that the upcoming year may bring even deeper cuts in the State Budget and urged everyone to work diligently and cooperatively to help maintain the current systems for families and children. Committee, staff and audience members introduced themselves. She then asked if there were any announcements from the Committee members and the audience. There were none.

The Committee unanimously approved the October 2002 minutes as drafted.

**Director's Report**

Kay Ryan thanked all for attending and explained that the last half of the meeting will be an Executive Session held in the Jesse Unruh Building where the Committee will discuss budget and administrative issues. She invited any non-committee members to join.

She reminded everyone that the Transfer of Knowledge (TOK) Symposium will be on November 15<sup>th</sup>. The organizers have taken a "Stone Soup" approach to planning the meeting, the purpose of which is to move the agenda for inclusive child care forward. The challenge is that this is neither solely a child care issue nor solely a disabilities issue. There is no state or county entity charged with the responsibility of ensuring that child care exists for children with disabilities, but the issue touches many of us. The Committee made access to inclusive child care one of their priorities this year, hoping that the many people who are doing great things would see this as a logical extension or next step and would work with us to make it happen. And we were right. People have joined together to develop this event and have donated money, materials, time, expertise, staff, supplies, and labor. Teams from 50 counties, totaling 362 people, will be there. We want to offer a special thank you to the Local Child Care Planning Coordinators who agreed to perform as the Local Team Liaisons. The day will be a working session for county multidisciplinary teams. They will develop individual action plans to improve access to child care for children with disabilities within their communities. It has been hard to limit each team to only nine people, representing each service sector. A number of counties have planned follow-up meetings to involve the other stakeholders. The TOK is not the end. It is a powerful beginning. We hope to hold a follow-up state-level team meeting to bring the county issues to the state. We will give a full report at the next Committee meeting. We also are planning for the February 19/20, 2003 Local Planning Conference, which is only three and a half months away.

Ms. Ryan reviewed the many materials in the packets for today's meeting and thanked Children Now and the Urban Institute for making a sufficient number of their materials available so that all attending could receive a copy. She directed everyone's attention to Children Now's 2002 California Report Card which compares California's children to the rest of the nation and points out where we are making improvements and where gaps still exist. She also highlighted the Safely Surrendered Baby public awareness campaign. People in California who are unable or unwilling to care for an infant now can legally, confidentially and safely surrender babies within three days of birth. The campaign already has resulted in 11 babies being safely surrendered.

Unfortunately, another 37 were abandoned during this same period (17 found dead and 20 found alive). She asked everyone to help spread the awareness and to post posters and cards in non-traditional places.

Everyone at today's meeting was involved in the administrative review of child care financing, the Women's Legislative Caucus hearings on child care reform or other child care reform proposals last year. We know from the Governor's veto message on SB 390, the Master Plan bill, that he is "interested in reaching resolution with the Legislature and stakeholders regarding reforms to the State's subsidized child care policy." We do not know how that will be accomplished. We do know that the issues are complex, the stakeholders are many, and there are consequences that must be anticipated in making decisions. And these are challenging fiscal times. It was difficult to close the \$23.6 billion gap between revenue and spending last year and it will be even more difficult to resolve what is predicted to be a \$10.5 to \$20 billion deficit for 2003-04. She said she believes, together with Ms. Malaske-Samu, that the only way to minimize the impact on our most vulnerable populations and our future is by working together. The discussion process is underway. The Child Development Policy Institute (CDPI) conducted a Policy Summit a few weeks ago. Issue-specific workgroups are being formed under the auspices of the Children's Roundtable. Later in this meeting, Lupe Diaz, Nancy Strohl and Donita Stromgren will discuss that process and provide an update on the first two meetings.

Our goal in developing the format for today was to help ensure that everyone has access to the same information, knows what issues are being considered and understands how to contribute to the process. We can accomplish more by working together than any of us can alone.

Ms. Malaske-Samu announced that Rita Saenz has been delayed in a meeting with a State Senator and asked Cheri Schoenborn to give her report at this time.

***Cheri Schoenborn, Children & Family Services Branch, Department of Developmental Services (DDS)***

Ms. Schoenborn is the Section Chief of the Early Start State Services Section at DDS. DDS, like other state agencies, is facing the likelihood of significant cuts to their system. She will share information as it becomes available. Regional Centers are concerned about their clients having access to the full complement of services they have been determined to need.

There are a lot of issues around the increase in the numbers of children being diagnosed with autism. DDS has worked with the Association of Regional Center Agencies to develop best practice guidelines around the diagnosis, evaluation and assessment of service needs of those with autism. It is important for staff in Regional Centers to have this information so they can diagnose these children as early as possible to assure the best possible outcome for them. DDS staff person Ron Huff is going to all the Regional Centers to extensively train their staff on the best practice guidelines. Information about the reports of the increase in autism and the best practice guidelines is available on the DDS web site at [www.dds.ca.gov](http://www.dds.ca.gov). People can contact their local Regional Center and ask what they are doing about this problem.

There are a number of upcoming events. The Division for Early Childhood Conference on Young Children with Special Needs and Their Families is holding a large international

conference in San Diego on December 5<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup>. The Core Training Institutes are continuing. Information about the institutes is available on the Early Start page of the DDS web site. The fifth annual Family Resource Center Network Conference will be held on February 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> at the Sheraton Grand in Sacramento. The DDS Family Resource Centers are resource information centers for parents who have questions about their child's disability or who think their child may have a disability. DDS's next training event involves the Infant Development Association. This conference will take place in San Jose on March 20<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup>. Ms. Schoenborn invited everyone to attend the Governor's Holiday Tree Lighting on Tuesday, December 3<sup>rd</sup> at 5:00 p.m. on the west steps of the Capitol. The child selected to assist the Governor this year is eight year old Addison Davis. He has Down's Syndrome and has been diagnosed with autism.

Ms. Malaske-Samu asked if the rates of autism are increasing in other countries as well as the United States. Ms. Schoenborn replied that it is happening all over the world. There are many theories about why but there is no clear evidence as to the cause.

She added that the state Interagency Coordinating Council is meeting November 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> at the Red Lion Sacramento Inn. Information is available on the DSS web site.

### **California's Subsidized Child Care System: What Changes Will Be Proposed in 2002-2003?**

*Rita Saenz, Director, California Department of Social Services (CDSS)*

Ms. Malaske-Samu introduced Ms. Saenz and said she will help us orient ourselves to the fiscal situation we are heading into. Ms. Saenz said the issues we face, beginning now, will be the amount of funding available, the availability of child care, the quality of child care, and, foremost, the safety of children in child care. She reminded everyone that they have talked before, on her previous visits, about ensuring that the maximum number of children are served and that their parents are provided the maximum flexibility to respond to what the family needs. This time, rather than give a prepared message, she asked the Committee and audience to ask questions because this gives her a direction about things to look at as these discussions happen inside this administration.

**Q.** Are any more changes being proposed for the current fiscal year?

**A.** Ms. Saenz said she has not received any signal that there will be changes in the proposals developed last year for 2002-03. She asked Lyn Vice to review some of the agreements that were made with advocates. Ms. Vice said there were proposals about eligibility limits – questions about whether or not to cap eligibility at the 75 percent state median income, both at the entry level and the exit level. Embedded in those proposals were ideas about whether eligibility levels ought to be regional in consideration of the fact that some parts of the state have a much higher cost of living. There were proposals about looking at the reimbursement rates for providers and what the ceiling should be. Embedded in this were questions about whether all types of providers, both licensed and exempt, should be reimbursed at different levels. There were discussions about increasing the family fees so that families contributed earlier on in their access to the subsidies and paid a greater share of the costs before leaving, eliminating the “cliff” effect. There were discussions about how to deal with the waiting list

and how to structure the CalWORKs stages so there would not be a competition for child care between CalWORKs families and low income working families. There were discussions about program integrity and administrative rates, about continuing to serve children age 13 and older, and about the small number of CalWORKs families remaining in the program that were grandfathered in when state median income limits dropped from 100% to 75% in 1998. There was also a discussion about whether, in effect, working poor families and CalWORKs families are actually different, and did we want to “dump” CalWORKs families and serve some new families, which would have meant creating as much of a problem as we had before.

**Q.** Is there any more discussion on the elimination of Stage 3 funding?

**A.** We are not having those discussions right now because all of the budgets are up in the air. Our Department has just begun discussions with the Department of Finance (DOF) about what any of the budget looks like. The budget deficit for the coming year is estimated to be \$10 billion. She said she has not heard any definite proposals for raising revenues or for cutting services. In effect, state agencies are as mystified as the field is about what can be done. She hopes that if the decision were made to increase revenues, a portion of the money would go to child care. But she cannot guarantee that. It may be that child care advocates will have to take a position on raising revenues and cutting services and find a vehicle to encourage people to take action in that direction.

**Q.** We are already seeing problems locally with backups on criminal exemption clearances caused by the budget situation. Do you have any information about this?

**A.** The Department cleared people who did not require exemptions. So we have not interfered with that process. She hopes that in the next month staff will begin to process exemptions again. It is likely that CDSS will put forth legislation this year asking for new crimes to be added to the non-exemptable list, for example, the crime of carjacking. The child care community and CDSS went through an unfortunate period of questioning last year about who is safe and who is not safe in child care and who should be working in child care and who should not be. There will be an aggressive campaign to convince the public that the people who work in child care deserve to be able to work there. We need to focus in the year to come on the benefits to the economy, the necessity of parents to have their children in child care, and our continued commitment to quality child care. Depending on what Congress does with TANF this year, we could be in a situation where CalWORKs recipients are required to work more hours and the state does not get more child care dollars. This will be a fiercely pitched battle. Everyone in this room and everyone involved with child care will need to be active with their congressional representatives because there are a lot of people in Washington who do not think we need more child care money.

**Q.** Of the policy issues we itemized in the discussions last year, are there any that you feel are now off the table or do you expect the package of proposals to be very similar to last year?

**A.** There has been no final decision on that. Given the situation with the budget, she cannot imagine a more generous package or where the money would come from for a more generous package. It is understood that some people cannot afford to pay more money. If the state reduces who is eligible, it is understood that it will create a hardship. In working with the child care community, she believes it is important to realize that we must be friends with our

friends. The Department and the child care community are on the same side in this discussion. The decisions the Department makes are not because we don't care. It is because we have run out of alternatives. We have to work together to take care of these families and their children and make sure it is done in a quality way. She does not feel we will get much help from the federal government, so we must help each other and ourselves.

- Q.** Are you saying that you don't see the possibility of an increase in TANF child care funding?
- A.** With the Republicans controlling both Houses now and the party's message that more money is not necessary, and with the Democrats not being in a position to get that money in the budget, we are going to have to get more involved, and we will. Each of us needs to call our representative's office and ask what he or she is doing in this area.

**Comment:** Nancy Strohl said that she agrees with Ms. Saenz's comment about remaining friends with your friends and developing strategies to reach the goals. She said she also believes there are many options still left and other alternatives to be looked at and developed. It is important that we don't make low-income families bear the brunt of the budget deficit. It is critical that the issues are addressed broadly and not just in budget hearings.

**Response:** Ms. Saenz agreed and said she hopes that the Department's involvement in the issue and the Department's collaboration with the California Department of Education (CDE) was a demonstration of how to work together. No one knows all the answers. She said she is willing to consider any ideas from anyone on resolving the budget problems.

- Q.** Do you believe the administration will continue to push for serving additional families with current resources?
- A.** No. People made a very persuasive argument about that. It is true that this Governor would like to see more low-income families be given the opportunity to have their children in this program. But there is no way to do that at this point. The issue is so complex and we need such a variety of solutions that it was decided to leave things as they were. We are still open to alternatives. The current proposals are a point of departure. At this point she does not see anybody proposing to serve more children with the current funding.

Ms. Saenz called everyone's attention to the passage of Proposition 49 which will provide before and after school services for children and noted that sometimes the people of California take things into their own hands. She asked what occurs to people when they hear that? An audience member responded that we could fight for higher revenue to fund all of child care. Another person said it would require someone from Hollywood to do what is necessary to accomplish this.

- Q.** Do you think the passage of Prop 49 will send a message to the administration about the relative priorities of voters? The funding situation is the same, but maybe people's priorities have changed.
- A.** The funding situation is worse. The anticipated \$10 billion deficit for next year is on top of this year's deficit. The Departments are looking at how they will hold on to what they have. They never considered cutting assistance to CalWORKs participants and she doesn't think they will do that this year, but it will come up because lots of people voted for a man who said he would cut government services. Everyone says they support child care but it doesn't

seem to register with them that the money must come from us rather than from those people who cannot afford to pay for it.

- Q.** Have there been any thoughts about increasing revenues through increasing alcohol taxes?
- A.** If there is a tax, it will not be on wine. Not in this state. If there are any increases in taxes on distilled beverages or beer, then the wine industry will feel they are next and will put up a fight, so no taxes will be put on alcohol in the foreseeable future.

**Comment:** Ms. Malaske-Samu pointed out that while we are in an incredible budget crisis, we have organizations going in disjointed directions. For example, Los Angeles County Prop 10 is looking at access to universal preschool and the Packard Foundation is looking at universal preschool. When we talk about subsidized services we're talking about services for a portion of the population. Prop 10 and Prop 49, however, were for all children. We could possibly gather greater support for subsidized child care if we could find a way to make the issue more universal.

**Response:** Ms. Saenz reminded everyone that alcoholism did not become a universal concern until middle class and celebrity alcoholics identified themselves as recovering alcoholics. The viability of the issue of preschool, for example, is that all can be served. She said that the suggestion of taking the position of "Everybody is going to get something out of this" is an important one. One of the underpinnings of this society is that things should be fair. It's an important point to consider. Why not have quality child care available to all children? Just because we've had a few down years doesn't mean we should give up on our vision. We need to hold on to that vision, and we need to know what to do when we hit situations like this.

She shared the story about two frogs that fell into a can of milk. They struggled as hard as possible to swim. At some point, one frog gave up, said to the other frog "I can't make it," and drowned. The other frog redoubled his efforts and after awhile he had butter and he jumped out of the can.

- Q.** Do you think we can get to the point where we will have a common statement statewide – a Master Plan -- as to our vision and goals and a plan for how we're going to serve families?
- A.** I hope that we do. Speaking just for myself and not on behalf of this administration, a vision is not a matter of compromise. But implementation is. If I felt that by agreeing to the vision it would raise issues regarding the expectation, I would be reluctant to engage in the process of it. If I felt that in order to make clear my vision and my alignment on the vision it would be used against me, I would not participate. If I felt on the other hand that the laying out of the vision for a long-term goal could help in good times and bad, and it would not be used as a cudgel against me, and I could remain friends with my friends, I would more seriously consider it. One of the good things about advocacy, if you're really good at it, is that it causes you to grow up and you learn that posturing and demonizing is not a useful part of the process.

You engage in the process so it becomes clear to everyone that we are not on different sides and you make organizational long-term agreements that ensure that that remains clear. The agreements must be such that the organization is willing to stick with them, even when key staff leave the organization. You begin by having a frank talk about the vision and about

limitations and methods, and about what to do when things don't go right and when they do go right. This would be sort of like making a prenuptial agreement.

**Q.** How would we go about doing this so that everyone feels comfortable that the process is safe?

**A.** There are four equal partners here -- the Department of Education, the child care advocacy community, the legislature, and the Department of Social Services. Those who come forward have to agree that they will not run and hide when things get tough. There was a little bit of that last year. This makes targets of the ones who remain. It has been suggested that the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) get into this. She feels that the more people involved in the process the better because then we're all using the same terms, we engage in looking at the vision and we come to some agreements about what will be done.

Ms. Saenz thanked everyone for hanging in there, for never losing sight of what they're here for, for putting up with the good and the bad, for putting up with the complications of the system, and for protecting the children and their families. She reminded everyone that "we are malleable." She was given a round of applause.

Joyce De Witt thanked Ms. Saenz and said she hopes she keeps the Committee in mind for future open forums and a place to dialog.

### **Overview of Children's Roundtable Workgroups & Process**

*Lupe Diaz*; Chair of the Children's Roundtable, and Senior Policy Advocate, Children's Advocacy Institute

Lupe Diaz introduced herself and gave an overview of the Children's Roundtable. The Children's Roundtable is a coalition/working group of about 200-250 children's rights organizations. They meet once a month to discuss and strategize about budget and legislative issues relating to children. There are four subgroups that meet on issues in specific areas: foster care, health care, revenue and budget, and child care. The revenue and budget subcommittee is looking at possible revenue enhancements. She said they are here today to talk specifically about the child care subcommittee. In September the subcommittee decided they needed a fall planning process to develop policy proposals to discuss with the Women's Caucus and other legislators. This is partly in response to SB 390, which was about the Master Plan for Child Care. Though they do not expect to come to consensus on all issues, there are two objectives to the planning process. First, they want to define and discuss policy options. Second, they want to identify potential areas of consensus. They think it is important to initiate these discussions before January.

The four workgroups looking at child care and their chairs are: License Exempt Care – Sujatha Branch from the Child Care Law Center; Staff Compensation, Retention and Professional Development – Rory Darrah from Alameda County; Provider Payments and Rate Structures – Donita Stromgren from the Resource and Referral Network; and Access, Affordability and Eligibility – Eve Herschopf from the Child Care Law Center.

They plan to have two to four meetings of each subgroup. All workgroups are open to everyone and all are invited. Each workgroup will develop a report to be shared with the Women's Caucus and other legislators identifying areas of consensus and potential consensus. Their reporting process includes the subgroup reports that will be made here today as well as a report at the December Children's Roundtable meeting. This will not substitute for individual advocacy, but they do want this to be a forum for discussion. They have an email list for each subgroup so the discussions can be continued.

**Q.** Will the subgroup reports include majority/minority views of the issues where there is no consensus so the field can get an idea of where people are at on the issues?

**A.** Yes. We plan to define the areas of majority agreement and areas where sides differ.

**Q.** When does the Children's Roundtable meet?

**A.** The full Roundtable meets the second Thursday of each month from 12 noon to 2:00 p.m. at the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Sacramento. The subgroups also meet in Sacramento but do not have set meeting times.

Ms. Malaske-Samu asked for regular reports to be made at Committee meetings so that information can be shared with those that have difficulty attending meetings in Sacramento.

### **Report on the First Two Roundtable Workgroups and Plans for the Future**

*Nancy Strohl, Child Care Law Center*

*Donita Stromgren, Child Care Resource & Referral Network*

Ms. Strohl said the License Exempt Care subgroup will have two meetings: one that has already taken place and another after the Governor releases his proposed budget plan in January. Email discussions will take place between the two meetings. The second meeting of the License Exempt Care subgroup will be an all-day meeting. The proposals developed will be in the context of the long term vision and issues the field will be looking at. The purpose of the first meeting was to get the issues on the table and give everyone an opportunity to be heard. Currently, 75 people are signed up for this workgroup. Over 150 people are signed up for one or more of the workgroups.

Several general principles were discussed at the first meeting. A lot of time was spent on how the definition of quality differs from community to community. Many felt strongly that parents need real choices. Some parents choose exempt care because it is a real choice. Others choose it because they have no other option. The group talked about real choice, limited options and building real choice. They discussed support for parents, the needs of the whole child, and how license exempt care is defined in California. They also talked about the relationship of license exempt providers to the whole child care system. Some family care providers felt strongly that we not promote or invest in license exempt care to the extent that we skew the system toward license exempt care and there is no training for licensed providers. They discussed children's safety. There were a number of proposals about Trust Line. Physical environment issues were discussed including ideas about doing advocacy with slumlords. They also discussed current efforts being made regarding outreach and recognition. All the discussions came back to the



balance of making sure there is training for everyone, but that not all of the training dollars are going to license exempt care which can be transitory.

Reimbursement rates issues were among the last issues to be discussed. Should the payment rate be based on licensed care, or should it be based on something else? What should be the relationship between the licensed reimbursement rate and the other? Should incentives be offered for special needs that are not met in any other way except licensed care? They also talked about tiered reimbursement.

Those were the initial issues raised. They are open to other issues and other formulations so that all the alternatives can be considered in the budget process discussions.

**Q.** Is the workgroup coordinating with the Prop 10 Children and Family Commission's panel that is making recommendations about exempt care?

**A.** It is very important that we work together. Workgroup members work closely with Proposition 10 in other areas. There are multifaceted ways the issues are being addressed.

**Q.** There is an accountability factor when we talk about using public monies for license exempt programs. Has the workgroup talked about how the process of accountability is going to work?

**A.** We have a subgroup looking at license exempt care not because we endorse moving in that direction but because it is one of our most contentious issues. One of the safety issues we discussed is who monitors exempt care? We all agreed that we do not want to deregulate any further.

**Q.** Is there anyone in the workgroup who is a license exempt provider or who is representing license exempt providers?

**A.** It was hard to tell. But there were people there who train or do work with license exempt providers.

Ms. Ryan added that she attended the first meeting and was amazed to see the diversity of those that attended and how representative they were of the state. She had assumed it would only attract people from Sacramento but people from all over the state were at the meetings. Ms. Strohl thanked both Sharron Goldstein and Ms. Ryan for their work with the Children's Roundtable.

Ms. Stromgren gave an overview of the first meeting of the Provider Payments and Rate Structures subgroup. About 40 people attended. It was a very diverse group, with many representatives from family child care associations, state and county social services agencies, resource and referral programs, alternative payment programs, subsidized center based programs, Head Start, labor, legislative staff, and other advocates. Family child care providers from Los Angeles traveled to Sacramento for the meeting at their own expense. Sacramento, Los Angeles and the northern part of the state were heavily represented. She said they would work on having more representation from the Central Valley at future meetings. It was beneficial to bring such a diverse group of people together to hear others in the field speak about the issues. It was an

opportunity to get a greater understanding of the depth of the child care delivery system and to acknowledge the issues and challenges that we face.

The issues being addressed by this subgroup differ from the other three subgroups in that they are more defined already. Three main issues were discussed. One was the Regional Market Rate, which is the rate by which both family and center child care providers as well as license exempt providers are paid through the Alternative Payment system and the CalWORKs system. The second was the Standard Reimbursement Rate, which is the rate by which subsidized center based programs are reimbursed. This rate was just raised by a two percent COLA and is now \$28 per day. The third was the proposals for tiered reimbursement.

They began the meeting with overviews of the history and current systems of the Regional Market Rate and the Standard Reimbursement Rate so everyone would have a basic understanding of these very complex issues.

This was followed by a discussion of the issues in those broadly defined areas. One issue is the need to simplify the implementation of the Regional Market Rate. Another issue is the high cost of administering the multitude of Regional Market Rates. With the increase in CalWORKs participants, there is an even greater difficulty in contracting for services for variable hours of care. Another problem is the need for the application or implementation of the Regional Market Rate that is consistent across counties. It also became clear that there are challenges with the definition of what a “region” is. For example, can a sub-area in a county be a region? The recent revisions in the Regional Market Rate have impacted families. For example, when the Regional Market Rate is lowered, will families be responsible for paying the difference between the market rate and the fee charged by a provider? There also are concerns about the impact of lowering the exempt rate below the current level.

Regarding the Standard Reimbursement Rate, the biggest issue is the need for equity between the Regional Market Rate and the Standard Reimbursement Rate. In many, if not most, counties, the Regional Market Rate is much higher than the Standard Reimbursement Rate. As a result, subsidized centers that have a wide spectrum of requirements are frequently getting reimbursed at a much lower rate than child care providers are getting through the voucher program. It needs to be clarified to the family child care network that the Standard Reimbursement Rate that comes to agencies includes administrative costs, support costs, salaries as well as payments to providers.

In the discussion about the proposals for tiered reimbursement, it was acknowledged that we already have a quasi-tiered reimbursement system because license exempt providers are paid a lower rate, and centers are categorized separately from family child care. One concern was that, if we look at any proposals for tiered reimbursement, we should look at them from the perspective of encouraging increased quality, not from the perspective of decreasing reimbursement levels.

Ms. Stromgren summarized by saying that three issues appear to be coming forward. (1) When making decisions around provider payments and rate structures, what we need to look at across all spectrums is what are the outcomes for children under any system of change in provider

reimbursement rates. (2) People want simplification of the Regional Market Rate system. (3) There needs to be some equity between the Regional Market Rate and the Standard Reimbursement Rate.

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked the panel for their presentation.

## **State Agency Reports**

### ***Michael Jett, Child Development Division, Department of Education***

Mr. Jett noted that this period is the lull before the storm. The comments made today prompt him to caution everyone that if we focus on restructuring we talk about changing the various variables, a lot of which is done in the perspective of an AP system. This can have unintended consequences in the classroom based or center based system. For example, if you have lost a few students and cannot fill a classroom, in a large program you can close the classroom and move students around. But the loss of those students can be disastrous for a small program where you do not have that flexibility and where you may have a problem funding a teacher's salary for the smaller class.

Ironically, there is real national interest in early learning, but no money to put into it. The President signed the Reform of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is called "No Child Left Behind." It has strong accountability requirements regarding teacher qualifications and testing. There also is a voluntary effort coming out of the White House and the U.S. Department of Education called "Good Start, Grow Smart." This promotes early learning guidelines in the states. On September 18<sup>th</sup> representatives from ten states were invited to Washington, D.C. to meet with other people from the Department of Education, Head Start, and the Child Care and Development Fund in each of those states. They talked about who has what and how they got there and how they can promote early learning guidelines in the states. Starting next week there will be some invitational early childhood educator academies – one in Los Angeles on November 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>, one in Saint Louis on December 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>, and one in Miami on December 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>. They will be looking at voluntary early learning guidelines, at early assessment issues, and at professional development for early childhood educators. California has already developed some initiatives relating to those issues. We have very comprehensive Pre-K learning and development guidelines. We provide live satellite broadcast training for the California Association for the Education of Young Children. We also are developing a Pre-K curriculum as a companion to the Pre-K guidelines. Both of these are articulated with our K-12 academic content and performance standards. The administration has had interest in all of these efforts. We have another project that is working to adapt the Pre-K guidelines and curriculum to home care settings because so many of our children are in home care rather than in classroom settings.

Another initiative they are working on is infant/toddler development learning guidelines. This came out of the interest in brain development and in defining good practice for infants and toddlers.

They also have developed the Desired Results Developmental Profiles, which are teacher observation and assessment tools. There are three for infants, one for preschool, and three for

school age children. They have entered into an arrangement with UC Berkeley working with WestEd on the infant/toddler, Sonoma State University on the preschool, and UC Irvine on the school age, to do a full standardization and validation of the Desired Results Developmental Profiles.

The Department is spending \$9.8 million for exempt provider training using quality improvement funds. They have received 1,400 playground safety grant requests for \$28.4 million from AB 1703. Applicants will be contacted this month to submit applications. CDE has devised an allocation methodology that will allow every applicant to receive a prorated share. The renovation and repair money this year will go to those who were not reached on last year's list.

**Q.** Are non-English speaking populations included in the standardizing of the Desired Results Developmental Profiles?

**A.** He said he's sure they are, but will check on this.

***Dr. Robert Bates, Department of Health Services***

Dr. Bates said that he has been on vacation for the past few months and regrets that he is a bit behind on the budget situation. The State Prop 10 Commission has identified five focus areas for potential funding. Two are concerns of the Department of Health Services -- dental health and mental health. The Commission will vote on the dental health issue at their next meeting. He said he anticipates that they will approve funding in the \$5 million to \$10 million range for projects in the area of oral health. A similar process will take place regarding the mental health area. He hopes that some funding will address pre- and postnatal maternal depression. Maternal depression can profoundly affect a child's development.

Mary Emmons suggested that the Committee revisit the subject of early childhood mental health at a future meeting. Marie Poulsen agreed and suggested including a look at populations that have health and mental health problems as a result of social conditions such as child abuse and neglect, family violence, substance abuse problems in the household, and the incarceration of a parent.

Dr. Bates asked for some feedback regarding whether child care providers think of physical or health disabilities when they are thinking about children with special needs. There was a brief discussion about Healthy Child Care America, which has a California branch, followed by a discussion about interagency communication and collaboration problems.

***Lyn Vice for Venus Garth, Welfare to Work Division, California Department of Social Services***

When the budget was passed, a trailer bill, AB 444, had a provision that limited retroactive child care payments for Stage 1. Her staff is developing an All County Letter that will implement this. They hope to have it out in December. They are getting feedback from counties and soon will ask for input from advocates. She thanked the Child Care Law Center for agreeing to facilitate the input of comments from all the advocates. They also will be developing regulations that will be out by July 2003 regarding the retroactive payments. The Department has been receiving word from counties that their allocation for Stage 1 is not adequate to serve those families. The

Department has requested additional funding for Stage 1. They are trying to find out how the reauthorization of TANF may be affected by the results of the November election. This could result in a one-year extension, followed by having to tackle the whole issue all over again.

**Bill Jordan, Community Care Licensing Division, California Department of Social Services**

The Criminal Record Exemptions process has been under review and is not quite complete. He is hoping that when it is, they will be doing a more comprehensive job of looking at criminal activity that might have had any potential for violence. Currently, there is not much of a process to confirm that those who are deemed inappropriate to work in child care do not end up working in some arena of child care. Under the new system, when someone is deemed inappropriate to work in child care, they are trying to develop additional safeguards to ensure that the person does not work anywhere in child care. They also are looking at how to quickly process the exemptions that have been held up during the moratorium.

Licensing will probably be impacted by the budget reductions that everyone in the industry is confronting. They are looking to the Resource and Referral programs, the food programs, and parents to be their eyes and ears to spot potential health and safety problems and bring them to their attention so Licensing can focus attention on facilities where these problems exist.

**Q. What is an acceptable crime?**

- A.** They look at the statutory guidelines for what is exemptable. Crimes that are eligible for exemption are crimes that do not have an element of violence. Staff looks at, for example, how recent the crime was, whether violence was involved in what led up to the crime, and whether there is a pattern of criminal behavior. Examples of crimes that are eligible for exemption include check fraud, shop lifting, and welfare fraud. A conditional exemption might be given to someone, for example, with a conviction for driving under the influence (DUI). They could possibly work in some role in the center but would not be allowed to drive the bus.

**Executive Committee Discussion of CDPAC Budget and Administrative Issues**

- The Committee discussed sending a letter to the Governor congratulating him on his re-election and outlining the mission, role and accomplishments of CDPAC, including the ongoing collaborations with CDSS, CDE and others.
- The January meeting was rescheduled from the 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> so the Committee can discuss the Governor's Proposed Budget which will be released on January 10<sup>th</sup>.
- The March meeting was cancelled because of the conference in late February, and the May meeting was cancelled to save money.
- Sharron Goldstein reviewed the 2002-03 CDPAC budget for the Committee using charts developed by Alex Castillon. Last year CDPAC had \$429,000 in General Fund monies. This year they have \$360,000 after the budget cuts. They have been asked to cut another 20 percent and staff have submitted a plan to that effect. These cuts would be in the areas of supplies, conference money, travel, and the Library contract.

- Contracts with CDE and CDSS provide additional funding to CDPAC; however, the 2002/03 contract with CDE has not been executed as of this date, and there may be a problem meeting payroll if it is not finalized soon. Kay will keep members informed on the contract's status.
- At this point it appears that the 2003-04 General Fund budget will be \$288,000. Members talked about how they might save money on travel costs and the need for all Committee members to participate in meetings and the upcoming budget discussions.
- Kay Ryan said there are 35 new Assembly members. She asked the Committee how they want to welcome them. The Committee discussed several options and decided to invite new legislative staff to come to the December meeting to be recognized and introduced to the Committee and members of the child development community. Legislators will be invited to a reception in the Capitol Rotunda as part of the 2003 Local Planning conference. An additional suggestion was made to have a half-day meeting in January and meet with new legislators and their staff members in the afternoon.
- Regarding the conference, Ms. Ryan said there has been discussion about holding a smaller conference in 2003, focused on local planning, with the Prop 10 coordinators, council chairs, and Committee members. It would be product oriented with lengthier workshops, and general sessions devoted to policy discussions.
- The members served as a committee-of-the-whole to draft a roster of candidates who will stand for election as officers of the Committee at the annual meeting in June: Marie Poulsen, Chair; Kathy Malaske-Samu, Past Chair; Lynn Lucas, Vice Chair; Secretary, Joyce Hanson; Treasurer, Earl Peterson.

Marie Poulsen commended Kay Ryan and Sharon Rea Zone for their leadership in developing the TOK Symposium. It began as a multi-agency effort but would not have happened without CDPAC.

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked everyone for the great work and adjourned the meeting

## ATTENDEES AT NOVEMBER 7, 2002 CDPAC MEETING

### Committee Members:

Kathleen Malaske-Samu, Chairperson  
Joyce Hanson, Grandparent/Child Advocate  
Jordan, CA Dept. of Social Services  
Marie Kanne Poulsen, USC Children's Hospital  
Mary M. Emmons, Children's Institute International  
Lynn B. Lucas, El Dorado County Supt. Of Schools  
Cheri Schoenborn, Department of Developmental Services

Eleanor Moulton, EduCare  
Earl Peterson, Child Care Consultant  
William Joyce De Witt, Public Member  
Dianne Philibosian, Public Member  
Robert Bates, Department of Health Services  
Michael Jett, CDD/CDE

### Participants:

Charlene Tressler, Child Development Associates  
Susanne Milton, El Dorado County Office of Education  
Lupe Diaz, Children's Advocacy Institute  
Vera Nicholas, California State Library  
Marcia Westbrook, CCCC of Nevada County  
Wendy Russell, County Welfare Directors Association  
April Befumo, Stanislaus County Office of Education  
Marilyn Rotnem, Merced County LPC  
Linda Wherry, Travis AFB Child Dev. Center  
Joyce Stone, Sacramento County LPC  
Alycia Young, Oakland Licensed Day Care Association  
Felicia Barefield, Roberts Family Discovery Ctr.  
Ed Condon, California Head Start Association  
Virginia Schemper, Child Dev. Training Consortium  
Michele Savage, Comm. Resources for Children  
Brian Lee, Fight Crime: Invest in Kids California  
Maureen O'Haren, CA Alliance of Boys & Girls Clubs  
Mark Carlson, Luthern Office of Public Policy  
Janene Chico, Inter-Tribal Council  
Yolanda Mendoza, Migrant Education Region 2  
Cheryl Allen, WestEd-CPEI  
Maria Gregoso  
Peyton Nattinger, CA Early Childhood Mentor Program  
Shirley Baltazar, Madera County Office of Education  
Gail Beyer, Madera County Office of Education  
Donita Stromgren, Child Care Resource & Referral Netwk

Linda Parfitt, California Dept. of Education  
Kathi Walker, El Dorado County LPC  
Petra Nagerl, Child Care Planning Council  
Nancy Strohl, Child Care Law Center  
Becky Billing, Children's Network  
Pam Grisby, CDSS  
Kelly Graech, Calaveras County LPC  
Kathi Linquist, Contra Costa COE  
Virginia Cannon, Child Action, Inc.  
Alex Cooke, On The Capitol Doorstep  
Tim Fitzharris, Child Dev. Policy Inst  
Ellen Moratti  
Beth McGovern, California Now/EES  
Francine Nunes, Placer County LPC  
Tony Anderson, SCDD  
Louise Boley  
Lisa Verde, CDPI  
Pat Dorman, On The Capitol Doorstep  
Betty Chaney  
Debbie Escodep  
Barbara Coulibaly-Robinson  
Terry Morales  
Jimena Vasquez, MALDEF  
Fran Biderman  
Lisa Foster, CRB/California State Library  
Barbara Fields, Reaching Out

### Staff:

Kay Ryan, Executive Director  
Sharon Rea Zone, Analyst  
Priscilla Jong

Sharron Goldstein, Analyst  
Leslie Witten-Rood, Analyst  
Alex Castillon